



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/934,738

08/22/2001

Ingo Molnar

019322-000340

9016

24239 7590 11/20/2008

MOORE & VAN ALLEN PLLC

P.O. BOX 13706

Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

CHOUDHURY, AZIZUL Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2445

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/20/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/934,738	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MOLNAR, INGO	
	<b>Examiner</b> AZIZUL CHOUDHURY	<b>Art Unit</b> 2445	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

***Detailed Action***

This office action is in response to the correspondence received on September 19, 2008.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger et al (US Pat No: 6,256,712), hereafter referred to as Challenger.

1. With regards to claims 1, 5, 9 and 11, Challenger teaches in a communication server, a method of responding to a client application, the method comprising the steps of: a cache disposed in an operating system kernel (*Challenger's design uses computer and all current computers/servers inherently require an operating system and all current operating systems inherently require a kernel; see column 5, lines 41-67, Challenger*); receiving from the client application an application protocol request (*A webpage is a response to a request because a webpage must be requested by a client*) corresponding to a response that can be displayed as a combination of a portion of the response that changes and a part of the response that is static (*Challenger's design allows the webpage*

*(equivalent to the claimed response to request) to contain cached (equivalent to the claimed static) information; see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 5 and column 13, lines 57-62, Challenger); creating at the server the portion of the response that changes (Challenger's design allows the webpage (equivalent to the claimed response to request) to contain newly refreshed content (equivalent to the claimed dynamic portions/portion of the response that changes to the application); see column 2, lines 55-66 and column 13, line 65 – column 14, line 8, Challenger); sending the portion of the response that changes to the client application (column 28, lines 46-58, Challenger); retrieving the part of the response that is static from a cache disposed in an operating system kernel (a kernel is an inherent part of an operating system and a server inherently has an operating system; see column 13, line 57 – column 14, line 22, Challenger); and sending the part of the response that is static to the client application (column 28, lines 46-58, Challenger. Challenger discloses a design enabling the updating content within a server so that updated content is submitted to the client. The design allows for current copies of both dynamic (portion that changes to the application) and static data (objects) to be cached within the server (column 2, lines 5-8, Challenger). The cached data (objects) is consistently updated (column 2, lines 54-55, Challenger). When required, the data (objects) (both static and dynamic) are dynamically rebuilt as needed and provided to the client (column 2, line 53 – column 3, line 34, Challenger). Finally, the use of a cache/buffer/registry within an operating system of a computer is inherent).*

*While Challenger teaches a system for a dynamic (portion that changes to the application) and static webpage, Challenger does not explicitly recite a "request" and a "response to a request." Challenger however does teach the transfer of web pages. Official notice is hereby taken that it is well known to one skilled in the art that a web page is a response by a server to a request because a web page must be requested by a client. Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, to acknowledge a web page loaded onto a client as a response to a request by the client, since a web page is sent by a server as a response to a request from a client.*

2. With regards to claims 2, 6, 10, 13 and 14, Challenger teaches the method wherein the cache disposed within the operating system kernel is a protocol object cache (Challenger's design allows for caches (*column 2, lines 5-8, Challenger*) (*column 5, lines 51-52, Challenger*)).
3. With regards to claims 3, 4, 7, 8 and 12, Challenger teaches the method wherein the application protocol request and the reply are formatted according to a hypertext transmission protocol (HTTP) (*Challenger's design allows for HTTPD (Figure 30A, Challenger). Hence, HTTP is supported*)).
4. The obviousness statement applied to claims 1, 5, 9 and 11 are applicable to their respective dependent claims.

***Remarks***

The correspondence received on September 19, 2008 has been reviewed but is not deemed fully persuasive. The following are the examiner's response to the applicant's contentions.

The first point of contention addressed by the applicant concerns all the claim limitations of claim 1. The applicant contends that the Challenger art fails to teach the following claim limitations: 1) receiving an application protocol request from a client application; 2) having the server respond to this request by sending a portion of the response that changes to the client application; 3) retrieving a part of the response that is static from cache in an operating system kernel; and 4) sending the part that is static to the client application. The examiner strongly disagrees with this assertion. As per limitation 1, Challenger teaches the claimed "receiving from the client application an application protocol request" because Challenger teaches a webpage being sent to a client (a webpage is a response to a client request) (see column 2, line 56 - column 3, line 3). While Challenger teaches a system for a dynamic and static webpage, Challenger does not explicitly recite a "request" and a "response to a request." Challenger however does teach the transfer of web pages. Official notice is hereby taken that it is well known to one skilled in the art that a web page is a response by a server to a request because a web page must be requested by a client. As per limitation 2, Challenger does teach the claim limitation of "having the server respond to this request by sending a portion of the response that changes to the client application,"

Art Unit: 2445

when Challenger teaches the webpage (equivalent to the claimed response to request) can contain newly refreshed content (equivalent to the claimed portion that changes to the client application); see column 2, lines 55-66 and column 13, line 65 – column 14, line 8, Challenger) and sends the portion of the response that changes to the client application (see column 28, lines 46-58, Challenger). As per limitation 3, Challenger does in fact also teach "retrieving a part of the response that is static from cache in an operating system kernel" when Challenger discloses that the design allows for current copies of both dynamic and static data (objects) to be cached within the server (column 2, lines 5-8 and see column 13, line 57 – column 14, line 22, Challenger). The server inherently has an operating system and an operating system inherently has a kernel. As per limitation 4, Challenger teaches "sending the part that is static to the client application" within column 28, lines 46-58, Challenger. Challenger discloses a design enabling the updating content within a server so that updated content is submitted to the client. The design allows for current copies of both dynamic and static data (objects) to be cached within the server (column 2, lines 5-8, Challenger). The cached data (objects) is consistently updated (column 2, lines 54-55, Challenger). When required, the data (objects) are dynamically rebuilt and provide the client with updated content (column 2, line 53 – column 3, line 34, Challenger).

The second point of contention addressed by the applicant concerns the claim limitation of an application protocol request and a response to the request. The applicant alleges that the Challenger art fails to teach such limitation. The examiner disagrees. Challenger teaches a system for a dynamic (portion that changes to the

application) and static webpage. A webpage is a response to an application protocol request. Since Challenger does not explicitly recite a "request" and a "response to a request" the applicant challenges the examiner to provide evidence that it is well known to one skilled in the art that a web page is a response by a server to a request because a web page must be requested by a client. The examiner accepts and directs the applicant's attention to US Patent No: 6,279,001 (DeBettencourt et al). DeBettencourt teaches a web server, receiving from a client, a web page request wherein the web page request can be made using http or other protocols (equivalent to the claimed application protocol request; see at least column 4, lines 37-40, DeBettencourt). In response to the request, DeBettencourt teaches how a web server provides the web page (equivalent to the contended limitation of response to the request; see column 4, 21-24, DeBettencourt). Hence Challenger's teachings of providing a web page to a client is equivalent to the contended "application protocol request" and "response to the request" because a web page is a response to an application protocol request, as clearly explained by DeBettencourt.

The third point of contention addressed by the applicant concerns the claim limitation of a cache disposed in an operating system kernel. The applicant contends that the prior art fails to teach such a limitation, the examiner again disagrees. A kernel is an inherent part of an operating system and a server inherently has an operating system; see column 13, line 57 – column 14, line 22, Challenger.

The fourth and final point of contention involves the claim limitation of "retrieving the part of the response that is static." The applicant contends that the prior art fails to



teach such a limitation, the examiner disagrees. Challenger discloses a design enabling the updating of content within a server so that updated content is submitted to the client. The design allows for current copies of both dynamic (portion that changes to the application) and static data (objects) to be cached within the server (column 2, lines 5-8, Challenger). The cached data (objects) is consistently updated (column 2, lines 54-55, Challenger). When required, the data (objects) (both static and dynamic) are dynamically rebuilt as needed and provided to the client (column 2, line 53 – column 3, line 34, Challenger).

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AZIZUL CHOUDHURY whose telephone number is (571)272-3909. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrice Winder/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445

/A. C./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2445